



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Peter suffereth, like to our Lord's Passion—where Paul is crowned with John the Baptist's death."—De Prescript., nn. 14. The happy, the glorious Church of Rome, sir, is "walking in brightness," whilst the sects of the world are wandering in the valley of the shadow of death.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

WILLIAM ROURKE.

In the beginning of his letter Mr. Rourke expresses his opinion in words to which, with very little alteration, we can cordially assent. We believe that "when we seek for the true Church, we are not to look to the city nor the diocese of Rome exclusively [nor the Churches in communion with it]: all this is but a part of the true Church; and any Catholic city or diocese in the world is as much a true Church as the city or diocese of Rome; but we must seek the true Church in the whole body or society of Christians, wherever dispersed throughout the world." Our difference with Mr. Rourke is with regard to the limitation which he has thrown in, in which he makes unity in faith and communion with the Bishop of Rome an essential mark of the true Church. We require his proof of this; we want to know on what grounds he denies the share in the title of the true Church of Christ to the Church of England, and those other bodies who are not now in communion with Rome; and we want to know on what ground he applies to the Church of Rome exclusively those texts of Scripture which were spoken of the Church of Christ before the Church of Rome existed. We look in vain through his letter for any proof of this, to him, essential point of doctrine. He has certainly one great difficulty in his way, and that is the utter silence of Scripture, as to this very simple way of knowing the true Church. We have two letters written by St. Peter for the express purpose of enabling his converts to keep the truth after his death; if he knew of so simple a safeguard against error as to tell his disciples, whatever divisions might arise among Christians, to be sure always to hold fast by the See of Rome, can we suppose that he could possibly have forgotten to tell them of it? And what need of all the marks by which Mr. Rourke tells us St. Augustine distinguished the true Church from false ones, if he could have employed this very easy mark, that the true Church was that which was in communion with Rome?

Our readers will observe that Mr. Rourke asserts that no Church is a true Church which is not united in *faith* with the Church of Rome, and which is not united in *communion* with the Church of Rome. If they will look through his letter, they will see that he has not attempted to prove the last of these two things. He tells us he will prove that the Church of Rome is the Church of Christ, but he never tries to prove that the Church of England has not an equal, or even better right to the title. Whatever arguments he has brought forward apply solely to the point that the true Church must be united in *faith* with the Church of Rome. We shall then consider this point solely, omitting the other for which no proof is pretended.

Mr. Rourke's proof of the first point reduces itself to the text—"one Lord, one faith, one baptism," from which he infers that in the true Church there can be no difference in faith; and that, therefore, if the Church of Rome belong to the true Church, the Church of England cannot. But, of course, when Mr. Rourke asserts, and that rightly, that there is but one faith, he does not mean to say that there are no differences of opinion on religious matters between members of the true Church; if so, he would be puzzled to account for the violent disputes that have taken place in his own Church, such as those between the Dominicans and Franciscans for example. We suppose Mr. Rourke would answer that the points in dispute in such cases, however important, are not parts of the "one faith" which belongs to the Church, and that, therefore, a difference of opinion, in such matters, may exist without either of the parties ceasing to belong to the true Church. We approve of this defence; but Mr. Rourke will not find it easy to explain in practice how it is that the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception, for instance, should be declared by the Pope now to be part of the "one faith" necessary to salvation; and yet that three or four hundred years ago it should not have been so, and that differences of opinion in it could then have been tolerated.

We believe that the "one faith" is always the same. Those points of doctrine, the acknowledgment of which the ancient Church deemed essential to admission to her communion, we make necessary to ours; we retain the three creeds in which she embraced these essential articles of faith: she denied the name of Catholic to none who acknowledged them, neither do we arrogate the title of Catholic exclusively to ourselves, or to any one local body of Christians; we allow the possibility of salvation to all who hold this one faith which has been handed to us, however they may have endangered their condition by unauthorized additions to their system of doctrines. Let us see whether the Church of Rome has equally followed the example of the primitive Church. She does, indeed, retain the three ancient creeds; so far, well: we, therefore, admit the possibility of salvation in her communion, and allow her to be a part, though a corrupt one, of the Church of Christ. But she is not content with holding the one faith which the Apostles delivered to us. No sooner has one of her priests said Amen at the end of his repetition of

the old Nicene Creed, than, as if he had not come to an end, he goes on with the clauses of the new creed which Pope Pius IV. introduced into her system of teaching. The Church of Rome, then, has added to the old faith a number of points of doctrine, and anathematized all those who will not assent to them. We agree in faith with the Church of Rome as she once was; we cannot, at the same time, agree with her as she is now. Which are we to do? Must we change with her? By her anathemas she renders it impossible for those to remain in communion with her, who wish to preserve the faith the same as it was held by the primitive Church; and she has, therefore, as far as in her lies, inflicted a grievous breach on the unity of the Church; as far as she retains the old doctrines she preserves her right to be counted in the Church of Christ; but in her schismatical anathemas she has grievously offended. All Mr. Rourke's arguments are founded on the hypothesis of the *infallibility* of the Church, and have force against none who do not admit this modern notion. Let it be once supposed possible that a part of the Church may fall into error, and the whole flank of Mr. Rourke's position is turned, and every argument in his letter falls to the ground.

Mr. Rourke asks us either to grant that the Church of Rome was the Church of Christ before the Reformation, or else to point out what other body was then the Catholic Church. Now, it would be a contradiction in terms to assert that the Church of Rome was, at any time, the Catholic Church. The Church of Rome must be, by the meaning of the word, local and particular; the Catholic Church must be universal without any limitation to place. But it would be just as absurd if, while we denied the claim of the Church of Rome, to be the universal Church, we were to set up a similar exclusive claim for any other body. Mr. Rourke's alternative is founded in a complete mistake as to the position we maintain; he might just as well say "either grant that Lord Aberdeen is the House of Lords, or else point out to us what other nobleman is the House of Lords." A man who should use such an argument as this would be said to be utterly ignorant of what is meant by a House of Lords, and we think that Mr. Rourke's argument shows just as complete a misapprehension as to the nature of the Catholic or Universal Church.

Mr. Rourke's argument, then, is not enough for his purpose. He is bound to show not only that the Church of Rome was a part of the Church, but that no Church, save those in communion with the Church of Rome, has a right to the title. There were, for example, before the Reformation a great body of Eastern Christians, whose Churches were founded by the Apostles themselves, and who could claim equal antiquity with the Church of Rome, and had just as good a title to be reckoned in the true Church as she. Mr. Rourke's argument, therefore, that the Church of Rome is the Church of Christ *exclusively*, wholly fails.

But we can retort it on himself. We call on him to grant or deny that the Church of England and Ireland was a part of the Church of Christ before the Reformation. If he admits that it was, we call on him to explain how or why she forfeited her right to that title. The body of clergy and bishops remained the same, and the text, of which Mr. Rourke is so fond, directing the laity to "obey them which had the rule over them," had as much force after the Reformation as before. The Church of Ireland could only have ceased to be a part of the true Church if, at the time of the Reformation, she gave up any part of the "one faith," which the Church of Christ has always professed. This is what he is bound to prove: he is bound to show that any of those articles of Pope Pius's creed are contained in Scripture, or that their belief was ever professed by the primitive Church as necessary to salvation. Until he can prove both these points, he cannot say that the Church of Ireland has been guilty of any heresy in withdrawing her acceptance from these modern inventions; and he is bound, if he will not be guilty of schism, to return to the communion of the ancient Church of this country.

Nor is the Church of Ireland to be forsaken, because, at the time of the Reformation, the Church of Rome withdrew her communion with her. It is for the Church of Rome to defend her schismatical conduct, in requiring, as conditions of communion, articles unknown to the ancient Church, and in introducing, after a wide gap, a new set of bishops into a country whose Sees were already occupied.

Mr. Rourke says, that if the Church of Rome were the Church of Christ before the Reformation, she is so still, because her faith is the same then as now. We deny this altogether. First, let it be remembered that, at the time of the Reformation, the Church of Rome changed her creed by adding twelve new articles to it. But even since then she has changed. A single question will decide the matter. Is the Immaculate Conception part of the faith of the Church now? If Mr. Rourke says it is not, the Pope will probably give him a flat contradiction before long. Well, then, was the Immaculate Conception part of the faith of the Church of Rome before the Reformation? If so, how was it that holy saints and learned doctors refused to hold it, and were, nevertheless, recognised as orthodox members of the Church?

With this question we take our leave of Mr. Rourke for the present, proposing to consider, in connection with his next letter, the four marks of the Church which he offers for our consideration.

OUR LORD GOD THE POPE.

DOMINUS DEUS NOSTER PAPA.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

SIR—In reply to your article on the Pope, in the last number of the LAYMAN, I send you a few observations, compressed into a short compass, according to your often-expressed wish; but I must observe, that it is hardly fair to expect brevity in defence, when you reserve so wide a margin for attack. Objections are easily made, and occupy but little space, whereas the answers must be more diffuse, and accompanied by references, without which they are incomplete, and lead to no conclusion whatever.

It were idle to deny that these words, in their strict and literal meaning, are (what you have called them) startling, not to say blasphemous; that they were most injudicious all will allow. Strong as the case may appear, it is extremely old, for Constantine was of the fourth century. How very prudent and how convenient it is to seize hold of an expression, used hundreds of years ago, denied, according to your own showing, in the seventeenth century! Truly the French may say, "Qui dit trop ne dit rien."

The charge is so monstrous and so gross, that it merits the reply of O'Connell:—You either believe what you say, and are a fool; or do not believe it, and are a knave. Far be it from me to include you in either of these parties. I would fain hope that you fancied that the present generation might take these words without giving them a metaphorical acceptance.

Let us, however, examine the document, which runs thus:—"Satis ostenditur, a seculari potestate nec ligari prorsus nec solvi posse Pontificem, quem constat a pio Principe Constantino Deum appellatum, nec posse Deum ab hominibus judicari manifestum est."

The gloss or note is as follows:—

The most religious man, Constantine, in the holy synod which was assembled at Nice, seeing the complaint of several bishops brought before him, said, you cannot be judged by any man, for you have been called gods; and, therefore, you cannot be judged by men.—Canon, chap. 6.

Here Constantine, not content with giving this title to the Pope alone, gives it also to the bishops. We may well exclaim, "Qui dit trop."

But are there no precedents for this inflated and hyperbolic language of Constantine? In the seventh chapter of Exodus, we find the Lord said to Moses, "Behold I have appointed thee the god of Pharaoh, and Aaron thy brother shall be thy prophet."

The note in the Douay Bible—The God of Pharaoh—namely, to be his judge, and to exercise a divine honour, as God's instrument over him and his people. The note in Scott's Protestant Bible takes much the same ground. Moses was the favourite minister and great prophet of the Almighty; but it is elsewhere applied to persons in ordinary authority.—Exodus xxi. 6.

"His master shall bring him to the gods."—Exodus xxii. 8.

"The master of the house shall be brought to the gods." In Psalm lxxxi. lxxxii. 6.—"I have said you are gods, and all of you the sons of the Most High."

"The rulers of Israel, as immediately appointed by Jehovah, to be his representatives, to judge according to his law, and to be types of his anointed, were especially honoured with this high title. Ye are gods, in which other magistrates share in proportion to their religious advantages."—Scott's Prot. Bible (note).

Having endeavoured to show that Constantine figuratively based his appellation on Scripture authority, may I ask what Pope or Popes ever sanctioned such a form of address? Were they ever publicly applied to in this manner? and by whom? In order to do justice to the Popes, it is but fair to take the titles they themselves assume—not the mistaken and exaggerated language which inhabitants of warmer regions may have sometimes used.

The title which was first taken by St. Damasus, then by St. Gregory, is "Servus servorum Dei," according to the inspiration of their Divine Master and model. "He that is greater among you, let him be as the younger; and he that is the leader, as he that serveth."—St. Luke xxii. 21.

The Pope daily styles himself, before heaven and earth, a sinner; he hearkens to the prayer made by his minister, that God would have mercy on him, and pardon his sins; he has recourse to that rite of humility and penance—auricular confession—just as the lowliest of his spiritual children. During the holy week he imitates the example of our Redeemer in washing the feet of twelve mendicants. To conclude, Pope Gregory VI. (sic in MS.) was rebuked, by a Protestant lady, for permitting divine honour to be paid to him, whereas he was but a man. The Pope meekly answered, that he thanked her for the admonition, and that his position much required the safeguard of humility. I doubt not that his present Holiness would receive your homily in good part, were it to reach him.

* We can assure our correspondent, that we never wish to cut short real argument on either side of the questions discussed in our columns; and merely urge for the sake of our readers, as well as to increase their own chance of being read, that our correspondents, both Roman Catholic and Protestant, should make their communications as brief as may be consistent with doing justice to their arguments. Were we to put no restrictions on the length of letters inserted, our journal would soon become little more than a collection of letters, which probably would be read by nobody.—Ed.

You have alluded to the ceremonies attending the inauguration of the Pope, in order to show that care is taken to keep up in reality the claim, which in words has been withdrawn. This custom or ceremony is thought objectionable by many Catholics.—*Vide* Eustace's Classical Tour.

I remain, sir,
Your obedient servant,
ENQUIRER.

August 6, 1854.

The writer of the above letter has mistaken the gloss in which the celebrated words in question are found; and, consequently, all that he says about Constantine is irrelevant to the subject. That the word "*Deus*," in the sense of the Hebrew term "*Elohim*" (God), is applied to Moses and the Judges of Israel, is evident from the fact that, had this been its intended sense, it would have been sufficient to have said so, instead of stealthily withdrawing the word altogether.

Our correspondent exclaims, "How very prudent, and how very convenient it is to seize hold of an expression, used hundreds of years ago, [and] denied, according to your own showing, in the seventeenth century!" We answer, that we deem it both prudent and convenient to point out to our Roman Catholic readers the means by which the dogma of Papal infallibility was established in the middle ages. We think it judicious and useful to direct attention to the scaffolding, so to speak, by which the edifice of the Divine supremacy of the Pope was erected, though the wise builders removed it as soon as the structure was complete. Nor is it unimportant to observe, as we have done, that in the case before us, the removal was one of the fruits of the Reformation. Were it not for the indignant remonstrance of the Reformers, jealous for the honour of God, the portentous words, "Our Lord God the Pope," would, doubtless, have remained to the present day on record, a reproach and a disgrace to Christianity.

As to the title "*Servus Servorum Dei*" (servant of the servants of God), which the Pope assumes, we should be very happy, and universal Christendom would have reason to rejoice, were the humility denoted by it a characteristic of the Papacy. But we cannot forget that it was borne by some of the haughtiest as well as the worst of men—by a Hildebrand, a Boniface VIII., and an Alexander VI.

We are truly glad that many Roman Catholics object to the ceremonies which accompany the inauguration of the Pope. Still they exist; and their existence is a proof, as we have said, that, in the practice of the Church of Rome, the principle embodied in the words "Our Lord God the Pope," is still affirmed, though the words themselves are, for prudential reasons, repudiated.

ON THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

DEAR SIR—In your leading article for this month, you go to prove your right to the term Catholic, and very generously concede it to other Churches; and you quote Athanasius, in your defence—"This is the Catholic faith, that we worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in unity"—a portion of his creed against the Arians, showing the Catholic sense, and belief thereof, omitting essential articles of faith that Protestant and Catholic hold in common. The Greek and Protestant Churches, &c., would, in truth, be branches of the true Church, if they were only separated by distance, and not in belief. It does not require much argument to prove, that one only Church is Catholic; and all others, however numerous—and, God knows, they are almost numberless—have no right whatever to the title; if, as I remarked above, they all believed the one and same dogmas, ceremonies, internal and outward essentials of the true Church, they would, then, be one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church; but when they differ so widely from the parent Church, and wrangle so bitterly with each other, believing and teaching, at least, that their form, mode or conventicle, is just the thing to be saved by—the true, apostolic way—and all others, be what they may, are more or less astray from the one true path, that leads to heaven direct—comparing the Catholic Church to a tree and its branches, as a natural consequence, the branches must, and are all alike in appearance, in substance, and sap; its seedlings identical, its natural offspring essentially the same in all its propagating propensities; what more unnatural, than to see the olive tree bearing the prickly pear, the cocoa tree the rose of Sharon? "I believe in the Holy Catholic Church"—the apostolic sense is this, I believe it to be Holy, I believe it to be Universal; that it is the Church, fitted and appointed for all generations, for all ages, climes, and people; and that none other Church, be its pretensions what they may, is the Church of God; that communion with it is periling the salvation of whatever souls are subject to her teaching.

You claim not infallibility for your Church, therefore, you deny it to all Churches. You claim the title of Catholic for your Church, therefore, you concede it to all Churches, conventicles, and meetings, that prayer is their professed object. What have you gained by this? Are the numberless Churches universal in time, place, and doctrine? Were the Apostles to preach on earth again, would they recognise Catholicity in those religious denominations? Who will answer me Yes? You believe, as Catholics do,

that bishops are of divine origin. The Scots Church believes them useless, an encumbrance, yea, unholy things. What think you of this? Are they Apostolic thus far? Are they Catholic for all this? And the numerous good citizens of the world, who preach the utter uselessness of baptism, are they Catholic in the true Apostolic sense? It would take more space than you could admit of to enumerate the particulars and inconsistencies of the numberless Churches that claim Catholicity for their mark; and each and all would deem themselves deeply insulted were you to question their right to said mark—*Catholic*.

I am, dear sir,
Yours respectfully,
A ROMAN CATHOLIC.

Carlow, July 23, 1854.

There are some Protestants who think that all Roman Catholics hold precisely the same set of religious opinions, and treat them accordingly; and many Roman Catholics return the compliment by imagining a set of opinions which they suppose all Protestants must hold.

Both parties are wrong; for Roman Catholics differ as widely (if not more widely), among themselves, about religious opinions, as Protestants do; and few, or none, can be found among Protestants who really hold the opinions which Roman Catholics often attribute to all Protestants. Our correspondent falls into this mistake; he has in his own head a certain set of notions, which he considers "Protestant;" and then he feels quite sure that we must hold these notions, and that we must have written them too, although we defy him to find them in our paper.

What else can we say of a correspondent who writes to us thus:—"You claim the title of Catholic for your Church, therefore, you concede it to all Churches, conventicles, and meetings." "And the numerous good citizens of the world who preach the utter uselessness of baptism, are they Catholic?" We certainly have never said anything of the kind: and we have said before now that we regard baptism as the only entrance into Christ's visible Church on earth; and we certainly have never extended the term "Catholic" beyond the members of that Church.

We think it must be evident to any one who reads the article to which our correspondent refers, that we were then considering "Catholicity" only as it refers to faith. Churches which hold the Catholic creeds unchanged, as their articles of faith—those we consider Catholic in respect of faith; this was our assertion in that article, as well as in others; and to this judgment we adhere.

Where the question of Catholicity in conduct and action comes in, we do not scruple to declare our judgment, that those who cause divisions and separations in the body of Christ, are so far offenders against Catholic communion. But here we insist that facts are to be examined, and offences and divisions laid to the account of those who are truly and really guilty of them. And when this is done, we find that the Church of Rome is more guilty of offences against Catholic communion, than any other section of professing Christians in the world.

Take the case of the Lutherans, whom we mentioned in our article. The Lutherans never went out of the Church, or separated from it, by any act of their own. All they asked was to remain in communion with the whole Church—with the Church at Rome—with the Pope himself—on these terms—viz., holding the ancient Catholic creeds as the only true and complete summary of the Catholic faith; and doing nothing in the service or worship of the Church contrary to the word of God. Rome answered them by adding twelve new articles to the ancient creeds, and REFUSING TO HOLD COMMUNION with any who would not profess those new articles as part of the ANCIENT CATHOLIC FAITH. Was it not Rome that was really guilty of breaking Catholic communion? The Apostles not only directed that unity should be preserved, but they settled the terms of communion; and the ancient Church embodied and preserved those terms in the Catholic creeds. The Lutherans asked nothing, but that communion should be preserved on those apostolic terms. Rome altered the terms, and refused to communicate on the terms of the ancient Catholic creeds. And now, forsooth, on account of this, the Romanists only are Catholics, and the Lutherans are not Catholics!

It is no part of our business to prove that the Lutherans were right in everything. In the matter of the Lord's Supper, and in the matter of images, they did not sufficiently throw off all Romish errors. In some of the constitutions of an apostolic Church, they were defective; but that was not by their own choice, but by the conduct of the German bishops. And we believe that God will visit all offences on the guilty, and not on the innocent.

It is no part of our business to deny that some Protestant sects, who are Catholic in respect of their faith, have committed offences against Catholic unity; just as the Church of Rome has done, though, perhaps, seldom to the same extent. We do not justify such things. We do not wish our readers to be partakers of offences, by whomsoever committed. We show our readers a Church—the ancient Catholic Church of this country—a Church which makes no terms of communion but the ancient Catholic creeds—a

* We beg our Roman Catholic readers to try and understand what we mean by "Protestant," we do not mean simply all who reject the peculiar doctrines of the Church of Rome; Mahometans believe that the religion of Rome is false and idolatrous, yet we do not count them Protestants, because they do not hold the fundamental doctrines of the Catholic faith; we say just the same of Socinians.

Church which does not owe its existence to any act of separation—which has never committed any act of schism—and we say this is the Church to which Christians, in this country, ought to belong. Let our correspondent, if he can, bring forward a definite charge of schism against this United Church of England and Ireland, showing what specific acts of schism she has committed, and when and where those acts were committed—and we are ready to answer him. But, if he can say only that some other Protestant bodies have offended against Catholic unity, we answer that such a fact has nothing at all to do with the course which we recommend to the Irish people; and, therefore, it is foreign to the purpose of our journal to discuss it.

Our correspondent repeats the old argument, so often answered, "it does not require much argument to prove that one only Church is Catholic; and all others, however numerous, have no right whatever to the title."

Now, the word "Catholic" simply means "universal." Let us, therefore, put the word "universal" in place of "Catholic," in that sentence of his, and see what evident nonsense it becomes. "It does not require much argument to prove that one Church only can be universal, all others, however numerous, can have no right whatever to the title!"

In St. Paul's days, there was a Church of Rome, a Church of Corinth, a Church of Galatia, a Church of Jerusalem, &c., &c.; which one was then universal? Was not each one "universal" or "Catholic," as a part of the whole—none universal by itself alone? And how can it be otherwise now? No Church is now universal by itself alone. Each Church, so far as it holds the Catholic creeds, and adheres to the apostolic terms of communion, is "Catholic" or "universal," as being a part of the whole; and, in this sense, which is the true sense, Rome (which had added to the Catholic creeds, and refused to communicate with others on the terms settled by the Apostles) has, perhaps, the weakest title of all to the name of "Catholic."

INFALLIBILITY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

MR. EDITOR—Will you kindly insert the following questions:—

1st—If the Church is infallible, how is it that St. Paul says, there should be an apostasy, a falling away from the true faith? such a thing, I imagine, could not occur if the Church had the promise of infallibility.

2nd—Why did St. Paul, in his epistle to the ancient Church of Rome, charge them not to be high-minded but fear. For if God spared not the natural branches take heed lest he also spare not thee. Now, I think St. Paul must have thought very little of infallibility when he said that.

3rd—In the Apocalypse we find our Lord reproving, exhorting, and comforting the Seven Churches of Asia, as each required; the Church of Laodicea, especially, he rebukes very sharply, he brings against it the charge of unfaithfulness; now, surely, that Church was a partaker of the promise of the Holy Spirit "that He should guide it into all truth," as well as any other, and yet it was infallible, it wanted life; and the Church of Sardis, also, "had a name that it liveth," and our Lord says it was dead. It is plain enough then, I think, that these two Churches were not infallible. With these instances, therefore, I think we may conclude, that no Church is infallible.

If there was no danger, why did St. Paul warn the Romans against "high-mindedness?"

If some of your Roman Catholic correspondents will kindly answer the above questions and satisfy me, they will greatly oblige

Your obedient servant,
W. R.

FLOWERS FOR AUGUST.

IF August be less prolific than the preceding month in its flowers, it is more abundant in its fruits; and the rich corn waving over the fields imparts a substantial beauty to the land, which many will regard more than the most glorious display of flowers. Along the roadsides we find in full flower the BRAMBLE (*Rubus suberectus*). Its two principal varieties are the Raspberry and the Blackberry. The raspberry (*Rubus idaeus*)—so called from the rasp or roughness of its fruit—is found wild in the woods of Ireland. Its delicious fruit is too well known to need further notice. The Blackberry (*Rubus fruticosus*) displays its erect flowers and petals of delicate pale pink, on its long, flexible sprays in our hedges and thickets; its fruit, when ripe, is both wholesome and agreeable. Who has not gathered blackberries in the days of childhood, or even of mature age, and enjoyed the feast, which nature's bounty afforded without culture or care, with as much pleasure as the rarest fruits the garden or hothouse could give? The Bramble is the subject of the oldest apologue or fable extant, called Jothan's (or Joathan's) parable, and narrated in the Book of Judges, ix., v. 8 to 15.

Another humble, but sweet flower of the riverside and summer stream, to which we are much attached, is the MEADOW-SWEET (*Spiraea ulmaria*). Its flowers of yellowish-white or cream-colour, are to be gathered almost in the water itself, whence it peers out like a piece of lace-work embroidery, so soft that even the rude winds seem loth to disturb it, except to waft its sweet perfume over